

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments recited above. The amendments have been made in response to the Examiner's allowance of previous claim 2. The remaining claims incorporate the limitation of previous claim 2. Claims 1, 3-6, 9, 11-14 and 22-25 are amended. Claims 2, 8, 10 and 17-19 are canceled. Claims 1, 3-7, 9, 11-16 and 20-25 are pending in this application.

**35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1 and 3-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,035,121 issued to Chiu et al. (hereinafter "Chiu") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,634,114 issued to Shipley (hereinafter "Shipley"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

**Claim 1** is amended to recite a method comprising the steps of "storing a computer application program in a first logical directory of one or more computer-readable media" and "storing a first version of a shared component in the first logical directory for execution with the computer application program on a computer system that stores at least a second version of the shared component in a second logical directory of the one or more computer-readable media, wherein the first component is a functional component of the computer application program that is compatible therewith." (Amendment emphasized).

Furthermore, "the computer application program is configured to use the first version of the shared component and not the second version of the shared component when the computer application program is executed on the computer system."

1 Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate certain limitations of previous  
2 claim 2, now canceled, which was not rejected by the Office - only objected to as  
3 depending from a rejected independent claim.

4 Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over the cited references and the rejection  
5 thereof should be withdrawn.

6 **Claim 2** has been canceled.

7 **Claim 3** has been amended and now depends from claim 1. Claim 3,  
8 therefore, is allowable at least by virtue of that dependency and the rejection  
9 should be withdrawn.

10 **Claim 4** has been amended to recite one or more computer readable media  
11 that store computer-executable instructions for performing the steps of "storing an  
12 application in a **first** directory of a computer system," "storing a local version of a  
13 shared program component in the **first** directory" and "installing a file that  
14 indicates to the application that the application should utilize the local version of  
15 the shared program component without regard for a **second version of a shared**  
16 **program component stored in a second directory of the computer system.**"  
17 (Amendment emphasized).

18 Claim 4 also recited that "the local version of the shared component is a  
19 functional component of the application that is compatible therewith."

20 As amended, claim 4 is allowable over the cited references. Accordingly,  
21 the rejection of claim 4 should be withdrawn.

22 **Claim 5** has been amended to recite a method comprising the steps of  
23 "calling a shared component in a computer system," "detecting a local file that  
24 indicates the presence of a locally-stored version of the shared component, the  
25 local file being a different file than the shared component itself" and "in response

1 to detecting the local file, utilizing the locally-stored version of the shared  
2 component **that is stored in a first directory of the computer system** instead of a  
3 global version of the shared component present in a **second directory of the**  
4 computer system.” (Amendment emphasized).

5 Claim 5 now includes the allowable subject matter contained in previous  
6 claim 2, now canceled. Therefore, claim 5 is allowable over the cited references  
7 and the rejection thereof should be withdrawn.

8 **Claims 6 and 7** depend from claim 5 and are allowable at least by virtue of  
9 that dependency. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

10 **Claim 8** is canceled, thus rendering the rejection thereof moot.

11 **Claim 9** has been amended and now recites one or more computer-readable  
12 media containing computer-executable instructions that, when executed on the  
13 computer, perform the following steps: “storing a computer application program in  
14 **a first directory of a computer system that maintains a multiple-level directory**  
15 **structure”** and “storing a first version of a shared component in the **first**  
16 **directory for execution with the computer application program** on the  
17 computer system, the computer system storing at least a second version of the  
18 shared component **in a second directly of the computer system.”** (Amendment  
19 emphasized).

20 Furthermore, according to claim 9, “the computer application program is  
21 configured to utilize the first version of the shared component and not the second  
22 version of the shared component when the computer application program is  
23 executed on the computer.”  
24  
25

1       **Claim 9** now recites the limitations found to be allowable in previous claim  
2       2. Therefore, claim 9 is allowable over the cited references and the rejection  
3       thereof should be withdrawn.

4       **Claim 10** is canceled, thus rendering the rejection thereof moot.

5       **Claims 11-13** depend from claim 9 and are allowable at least by virtue of  
6       that dependency. Accordingly, the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

7       **Claim 14** has been amended and now recites a computer system that  
8       includes "memory divided into a plurality of discrete memory partitions," "an  
9       application program stored in a first memory partition," "a first version of a shared  
10      component stored in the first memory partition, the first version of the shared  
11      component useable by the application program," "a second version of the shared  
12      component stored in a second memory partition" and "an indicator stored in the  
13      first memory partition that, when present, indicates the existence of the first  
14      version of the shared component in the first memory partition."

15      Furthermore, "the application utilizes the first version of the shared  
16      component if the indicator is present."

17      **Claim 14**, as amended, includes the elements found allowable in previous  
18      claim 2. Particularly, an application and a first version of a shared component are  
19      stored in a first memory partition and a second version of the shared component is  
20      stored in a second memory partition. The presence of an indicator stored in the  
21      first memory partition informs the application that the first version of the shared  
22      component is stored in the first memory partition. So identified, the first version  
23      of the shared component is used by the application and the second version of the  
24      shared component is ignored.

1 Accordingly, claim 14 is allowable over the cited references and the  
2 rejection thereof should be withdrawn.

3 Claims 15-16 depend from claim 14 and are allowable at least by virtue of  
4 that dependency. The rejection of these claims, therefore, should be withdrawn.

5 Claims 17-19 have been canceled, thus rendering the rejection thereof  
6 moot.

7 Claims 20 and 21 depend from claim 14 and are allowable at least by  
8 virtue of that dependency. The rejection of these claims, therefore, should be  
9 withdrawn

10 Claim 22 has been amended to recite one or more computer-readable media  
11 containing "a directory tree data structure having multiple directories." The  
12 directory tree structure of the computer-readable media include "a first directory  
13 that contains a pointer to a first version of a shared component useable by a  
14 plurality of computer programs" and "a second directory that contains a pointer to  
15 an application program and a pointer to a second version of the shared  
16 component."

17 The application program "utilizes the second version of the shared  
18 component when the application program calls the shared component."

19 The amendment to claim 22 adds limitations found to be allowable in  
20 previous claim 2. Therefore, claim 22 is allowable over the cited references and  
21 the rejection of claim 22 should be withdrawn.


22 Claims 23-25 depend from claim 22 and are allowable at least by virtue of  
23 that dependency. Accordingly, the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.  
24  
25

Conclusion

All pending claims 1, 3-7, 9, 11-16 and 20-25 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: DEC 22, 2003

By:  for  
James R. Banowsky  
Reg. No. 37,773  
(509) 324-9256x216

DAVID A. MORAN  
# 42905